



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

recourse to Arbitration for the prevention of Strikes and of similar complications which arise and are so disastrous to all concerned.

ELECTION EFFORTS.

Soon after our Annual Meeting came the General Election, when, as foreshadowed in the last Report, a special effort was made to interest the Electors of the United Kingdom in the question of Peace and War, and to elicit an expression of opinion from the various candidates.

An address to the electors was issued by the Committee and distributed in very large numbers, both in the form of leaflets for personal distribution and of placards, in large type, for wall-posting. A similar address was also issued by the Manchester Auxiliary and very extensively circulated. The Committee's address was accompanied by a number of striking and stirring appeals on The Duty of Electors, Avowals of Military Waste, Who Holds the Nation's Purse Strings? Who Votes the Nation's Money? Armament and Disarmament, The Army Reserve and the Labor Market.

About four hundred thousand copies of these were distributed among the electors. A series of questions to be addressed to candidates was also prepared, and printed copies were sent to our representatives and helpers in the various constituencies throughout the Kingdom. The peace question was thus brought prominently before candidates and electors. Many valuable expressions of opinion and adherence were elicited from the former, and very general testimony came to hand as to the influence which was thus exercised among the latter. It was undoubtedly a good opportunity well and effectively used.

GENERAL PETITIONING.

In conjunction with other societies, a special and strenuous effort has been made to carry out a resolution of the Berne Peace Congress in favor of peace. Representatives of the various British Peace Societies met in conference, in December last, in order to give effect to that resolution. It was resolved to take up the proposal heartily, and to confine the general petition (a form of which was adopted) to the invitation which had been extended to the Government of this country by the President of the United States to conclude a permanent treaty of arbitration with America, which it was understood would be shortly brought before the House of Commons. Again, the co-operation of our friends throughout the country was solicited. Twenty thousand petition forms were distributed, and very gratifying results were attained. Although not more than 716 petitions have been reported as actually presented to the House of Commons (114 of which were signed on behalf of public gatherings), with a total number of 78,250 signatures, the obtaining of these signatures awakened a great deal of interest in the question, and evoked a great deal of sympathy. Among them were the names of some of the most influential inhabitants of the towns, or districts, from which they were sent.

EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS.

The ordinary work of the Society, in its public advocacy of the peace question, has been pursued with increased activity. This is, in many respects, the most important part of its operations. For, however attractive may be some more prominent forms of service, they must all rest upon a steady, persistent creation and education of

public opinion. Political action is possible only as it is backed and inspired by popular sentiment. The primary effort in any real propagandism must be to evoke and direct the public conviction and enthusiasm which will be its inspiration and strength.

"ALL IS FAIR IN WAR AS IN LOVE."

BY MRS. E. E. HORNIBROOK.

"All is fair, as in love, so in war,"
So sang to himself a jolly tar,
Not on a noble, high ship of old,
But a modern ram, as we are told,
A thing that goes right under the sea,
Built only for death and misery.

For years and years was the thing a thought
Before it was to perfection brought,
And long it was ere its steel-clad nose
Could carry destruction to its foes,
And the ram, while keeping water-tight,
Could sink in the ocean out of sight.

I wonder if, in some dreadful hour,
When it proves to the world its warlike pow'r,
O'er the work it did beneath the deep
Shall women be found to mourn and weep,
And wish its famous constructor far
From holding all fair in the art of war.

The gunners the great field-piece surround
As it is borne to the battle ground;
Where can it command the finest range,
This mighty weapon, of force so strange
That it can blow with its lurid breath
Brave men right into the jaws of death?

Modern *improvements* (?) and talents bent
On new modes of killing, all intent,
Guns that can send the fullest volley;—
Oh, worse than waste and more than folly!
Money and time, with an aching brain,
For wholesale slaughter and living pain.

I wonder when such men come to die,
And their record is gone up on high,
Will this plea stand in the land afar—

"All things were fair in the art of war"?
Or will war itself look fair or grim
In a dawning light as earth grows dim?

SUCCESS OF ARBITRATION.

The following list of cases in which important difficulties between nations have been settled by arbitration is abundant proof of the practicability of this means of adjusting international disputes and of its infinite superiority over war. In these instances the trouble has not only been quickly and inexpensively settled, but also settled for all time. No war has ever risen over one of these decisions of an arbitral court, in all except two or three instances the decision has been cheerfully accepted by the unsuccessful nation, and instead of deepening ani-

mosities and jealousies as war does, these settlements have brought the countries into much more friendly relations. The list is sufficiently long to show that arbitration has in less than a century become the rule for the adjustment of differences between civilized countries. The United States has been a party to nearly one-half of these cases.

1. Arbitration between the United States and Great Britain in 1816, about St. Croix River and the Lake Boundaries. Referred to three Commissioners. Conclusion accepted by both sides.

2. The United States and Great Britain in 1818, about obligations to restore slaves in the possession of the British at the time of the ratification of the Treaty of Ghent, etc. Referred to the Emperor of Russia, whose decision was given in favor of America. Great Britain eventually agreed to pay \$1,204,000.

3. The United States and Spain in 1819, respecting excesses committed during war by subjects of either nation. Referred to a Commission, which was afterwards superseded by the cession of Florida to the United States.

4. The United States and Great Britain in 1827, about the northeastern boundary of the United States. Referred to the King of the Netherlands. The award was not accepted by the United States, and the matter was afterwards settled by a compromise.

5. The United States and Denmark in 1830.

6. France and Great Britain in 1835. Portendic claim, *i.e.*, claim for injuries sustained by British merchants in consequence of the absence of any notification of the blockade of the Portendic coast of Morocco by France. Referred to the King of Prussia. France adjudged to pay 42,000 francs.

7. France and Mexico in 1839. Mutual claims, arising out of a war. Referred to the English Sovereign, who decided that both claims were invalid.

8. The United States and Mexico in 1839. Claims by citizens of the United States on the Government of Mexico. Referred to four Commissioners, and, failing their agreement, to the King of Prussia. Decided in favor of the United States.

9. The United States and Portugal in 1851, violation of territory in the case of the ship "General Armstrong." Referred to the Emperor of the French, who decided that the Portuguese Government was not responsible for what had taken place.

10. The United States and Great Britain in 1853. Claim for value of slaves who captured the ship "Creole" and sailed to a British port, where they were liberated. Referred to a Commission, with Mr. Joshua Bates, of London, as umpire. American claims judged to be well founded.

11. The United States and New Granada in 1857.

12. The United States and Chile in 1858. Claim of compensation for silver bars and coin taken by a Chilean admiral from an American citizen. Referred to the King of the Belgians, whose award sustained the American claims.

13. The United States and Paraguay in 1859. Referred to a Commission, whose award was duly given.

14. The United States and Costa Rica in 1860. Pecuniary claims. Referred to a Commission.

15. The United States and New Granada. Pecuniary claims. Referred to a Commission.

16. Great Britain and Brazil in 1863. Imprisonment of British naval officers. Referred to the King of the Belgians, Leopold I., who decided that the action of Brazil was justified by the circumstances.

17. The United States and Peru in 1863. Alleged illegal capture of ships. Referred in one instance to the King of the Belgians, and in another to a Commission.

18. The United States and Great Britain in 1863, about the Hudson's Bay and Puget's Sound claims. Referred to two arbitrators, Hon. John Rose, of Canada, and ex-Judge Alexander Johnson, of New York, who awarded \$450,000 to the Hudson's Bay Company, and \$200,000 to the Puget's Sound Company.

19. Great Britain and Peru in 1864. The Senate of Hamburg arbitrated on claims for compensation on account of the alleged false imprisonment and banishment from Peru of a British subject, and decided that the claim was based upon a partial and exaggerated statement, and was entirely inadmissible.

20. The United States and Ecuador in 1864. Referred to a citizen of each State (Ecuador and Colombia), who, with an umpire or arbitrator, should undertake "the mutual adjustment of claims," which was done successfully.

21. The United States and Venezuela in 1866. Claims by citizens of the United States against the Government of Venezuela. Referred to a Commission. Award in favor of the former.

22. France and Prussia in 1867. Question of Luxemburg. Submitted to a Conference of the Great Powers, which met in London. Luxemburg neutralized.

23. Turkey and Greece in 1867. Conference of Great Powers. Award accepted by Greece.

24. The United States and Mexico in 1868. Mutual claims for compensation for injuries inflicted by raiders on the frontier. Referred to the British Minister at Washington, who decided in favor of the United States.

25. The United States and Peru in 1868.

26. The United States and Peru in 1869. Referred to the King of the Belgians.

27. The United States and Brazil in 1870.

28. Great Britain and Portugal in 1870. Rival claims to the sovereignty over the island of Bulama. Referred to the President of the United States, whose award was in favor of Portugal.

29. The United States and Spain in 1871.

30. The United States and Great Britain on the "Alabama," in 1871. Referred to a High Commission, which awarded \$15,000,000 (£3,000,000) to the United States.

31. The United States and Great Britain in 1871, about sundry claims arising out of the War of Secession. Referred to a mixed Commission, which adjudged that the United States should pay £386,000 to Great Britain.

32. The United States and Great Britain (the San Juan dispute) in 1871. Referred to the Emperor of Germany, whose award sustained the American claim.

33. The United States and Great Britain (about Nova Scotia Fisheries) in 1871. Referred to three Commissioners, Sir Alexander Galt, Mr. Ensign H. Kellogg, and Mr. Maurice Delford, who awarded \$5,000,000 (£1,000,000) to Great Britain.

34. Japan and Peru in 1872. Seizure of the Brazilian

barque "Maria Sury," engaged in the Coolie trade, and the liberation of those on board. Referred to the Emperor of Russia, whose decision was in favor of Japan.

35. Great Britain and Brazil in 1873. Dundonald claims. Referred to United States and Italian Ministers at Rio. Gross amount of award against Brazilian Government, nearly £40,000.

36. Italy and Switzerland in 1874. Disputed boundary. Referred to Hon. P. Marsh, the United States Minister at Rome, who decided in favor of Italy.

37. Great Britain and Portugal (about Delagoa Bay) in 1875. Referred to two British officers, General Goldsmid and General Pollock, by whom it was brought to a successful conclusion.

38. China and Japan in 1874. Murder of Japanese citizens in the Island of Formosa. Referred to Sir Thomas Francis Wade, the British Minister in Japan, who awarded a pecuniary indemnity to be paid by China.

39. Persia and Afghanistan (Seistan boundary) in 1874. Referred to two British officers, General Goldsmid and General Pollock, by whom it was brought to a successful conclusion.

40. Great Britain and Liberia in 1879.

41. China and Japan in 1879. The Loochoo controversy. Annexation of that Island by Japan. Referred to ex-President Grant, of the U. S. A.

42. The United States and Spain in 1879. Claims to indemnity for injuries inflicted on American citizens during the Cuban insurrection. Referred to Mr. Albert Klæer, the Italian Minister at Washington.

43. The United States and France in 1880. Claims of compensation for injuries sustained by subjects of either Power during the wars of 1863 and 1870. Referred to three Commissioners.

44. France and Nicaragua in 1880. Alleged illegal seizure of a French ship ("The Pharos") laden with arms, for the use of the revolutionary party in Nicaragua. Referred to the French Court of Cassation (Appeal), which had been selected by Nicaragua, and which adjudged that State to pay 42,000 francs with interest.

45. Chile and Colombia in 1880. Dispute relative to the transportation of arms for Peru across the Isthmus of Panama. Referred to the President of the United States.

46. The United States and Costa Rica in 1881.

47. Great Britain and Nicaragua in 1881. As to the sovereignty over the Mosquito Indians. Referred in 1879 to the Emperor of Austria. Award in favor of Great Britain.

48. Chile and the Argentine Republic (about the Straits of Magellan and their land boundaries) in 1881. Referred to the United States Ministers by those countries. Boundaries settled, Straits of Magellan neutralized.

49. Holland and Hayti in 1882. Alleged illegal capture of a Dutch ship. Referred to the President of the French Republic.

50. Turkey and Greece in 1882. Question of territory. Settled by Arbitration of the Great Powers. Thessaly ceded to Greece.

51. The United States and Hayti in 1884.

52. Great Britain and Chile, 1884 (about damages incurred by their subjects in the war between Chile and Peru). Referred to a Commission consisting of three members, one to be nominated by the Emperor of Brazil.

53. France and Chile. Similar claims. Referred to a similar Commission.

54. Italy and Chile. Similar claims. Ditto.

55. Great Britain and Russia in 1885. Afghan boundary. Referred to a Commission.

56. The United States and Spain in 1885. The seizure of a ship ("Masonic") for alleged smuggling. Referred to the Italian Minister, Baron Blanc. Award of \$51,600 to United States.

57. Great Britain and Germany in 1885 (about land claims of German subjects in Fiji). Referred to two Commissioners. Award to Germany, £10,620.

58. Germany and Spain in 1885 (about the Caroline Islands). Referred to the Pope, whose proposals were acceptable to both Powers.

59. In 1887, Arbitration by the Administrator of British Bechuanaland, represented by Captain Goold Adams, between two African nations—the Bakwena and Bamangwato—about rights to certain wells. Award to the effect that the wells should be equally divided accepted by both.

60. In 1887, between Great Britain and Spain, in reference to a marine collision. Referred to the Italian Government.

61. In 1888, a dispute between Italy and Colombia also in reference to a marine collision was adjudicated by a reference to the Spanish Government as arbitrator. Award in favor of Italy.

62. In 1888, a Joint Commission was appointed on the Fisheries Question, between Great Britain, Canada and the United States. The Commission successfully completed its work and gave its award, but, by a strictly party vote and by a narrow majority, the American Senate refused to ratify its decision.

63. Between the United States and Morocco in 1888. Italy arbitrating.

64. Between Portugal and Morocco in 1888. Referred to the Arbitration of France.

65. Between Holland and France in 1889, in regard to boundaries in Cayenne and Surinam. Referred to the decision of the Czar of Russia, whose award was given in 1891 in favor of Holland, but without prejudice to rights of French citizens.

66. Between Denmark and the United States in 1889, in reference to the seizure of certain American ships at St. Thomas, in the West Indies. Settled by the arbitration of Sir Edward Monson, the British Ambassador at Athens, whose award was given to Denmark.

67. In 1889, between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. Referred to President Cleveland of the United States.

68. In 1889, between Brazil and La Plata. Referred to President Harrison of the United States on a question of boundary, whose decision was accepted.

69. In 1890, between Great Britain and Portugal as to the Delagoa Bay Railway. Referred to Swiss arbitrators. (Still pending.)

70. In 1890, between Great Britain and Germany in regard to the Island of Lamu, on the East Coast of Africa. Referred to Baron Lambermont, a Belgian Minister of State. Award accepted by both Governments and published with their consent.

71. In 1890, between Great Britain and France in reference to territories, protectorates and spheres of influ-

Continued on page 162.

The Russian flagship Dimitri Donskoi attended by the Rynda cast anchor in Boston Harbor on June 26th. The flagship is the largest warship that ever came into this port. They were present at the unveiling of the Farragut statue on Wednesday afternoon the 28th ult. It is fortunate for Boston that they are here on a peace mission.

Much loss has resulted from the floods on the Mississippi. Many plantations have been under water, on account of breaks in the levees. One million dollars will not more than cover the damage.

The Infanta Eulalie left New York on the 23d of June, to return to Spain. She expressed herself as greatly pleased with the United States and with the cordial reception with which she everywhere met.

NEW BOOKS.

Harper and Brothers have just published a new work entitled "The Armies of To-day." It contains an account of the strength and organization of the armies of the United States and Mexico in America, and of the armies of Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Austria and Italy in the old world. The account of each of these armies is written by an officer of the said army. The work is illustrated by about one hundred engravings, touching nearly every phase of military life and equipment. It is finely executed in every way, and contains a great amount of valuable information for those who wish to inform themselves as to the state of the armies of the leading nations of the world.

The book is of course written from the standpoint of the military man who believes in war, and has all the faults of judgment arising from this view. Besides giving, with one exception, a careful and full account of their respective armies, these officers go out of their way to advocate the further development and increase of the armies or their maintenance at the present standard. From this standpoint the book will have its influence in keeping alive and fostering the spirit of militarism which is doing so much to ruin the nations, especially of Europe. This we greatly regret.

For example, Brigadier-General Merritt of the U. S. army writes thus: "From whatever point of view the operations of the army are discussed, whether as a force to defend the country against foes from without, to fight Indians and compel their obedience to the laws of civilization or to maintain the domestic peace of the nation, one fact is prominent above all others, and that is that our army has not been, and is not now, of adequate strength. The changes which have taken place in the science of war render an increase imperative." If this increase in our army begins, where will it stop? Every one who has looked into the rivalry of armaments over the sea knows that if we once set out in this perilous course there will be no stopping till we have placed ourselves on a par with the European nations. This will mean five to ten millions of trained men of war with all the attendant burdens of taxation. Our people will much prefer to adhere to our historic policy of having no standing army worth mentioning, a policy in the following of which

we have built up the greatest and strongest and most respected nation on the face of the globe. We can not reverse this historic policy without great peril to our liberties and our Christian civilization.

General Wolseley describes the English army. His views are well known, and he takes up much of his time in this article in advocating various reforms which he wishes to see introduced into the English army.

Lieutenant-Colonel Exner gives an interesting and faithful estimate of the strength and manner of organization of the German army. He is careful to say that it is inferior in size to the French army, and in a general article at the close of the book, on the military situation in Europe, he maintains that "it is the sword alone which now keeps the sword in its scabbard." "There is no stop that would not be identical with regress." This supplementary article gives valuable information as to the armies of many of the smaller European states.

In the description of the French army General Lewal speaks in glowing terms of its history, of its love of adventure, of its many brilliant successes, of its rapid reorganization since the disasters of 1870, etc. One would think, from this reading, that the old French love of glory by arms is as intense as ever, but this is not true. The old spirit is dying out, and there is no doubt that France to-day would be glad to join a general movement for disarmament, if she could see such a thing seriously undertaken.

The Russian, Austrian and Italian armies are described in the same *ex parte* way. Thus the book is not simply a plain statistical description of the armies of to-day, but a series of essays in which the figures are only an excuse for the setting forth of national characteristics, national military pride and of the necessity of keeping the national military organization up to the highest point of efficiency. Whether the publishers intend it to be so or not, "The Armies of To-day" is essentially a war book, maintaining and glorying in the old barbaric system of killing, which is totally out of harmony with the Christian civilization of our time, and whose existence in the midst of this civilization is a palpable contradiction.

It is difficult from this book to give any accurate statement of the size of the various armies in 1893. Most of the estimates are for two or three years ago. The essay on the French army gives no figures at all, but a poetic description of marches and manœuvres calculated to impress upon the reader the splendid discipline and heroic endurance of the French troops. The following table taken from the essay on the German army is a good and accurate comparative estimate of the military strength in time of peace of the five great nations of continental Europe for 1890:

	Battalions Infantry.	Squadrons Cavalry.	Field Batteries.
Russia.	1029	687	405
France	561	420	480
Germany.	538	465	434
Austro-Hungary.	458	252	241
Italy	346	144	207

The battalions have something less than a thousand men and the squadrons about one hundred and fifty horse.

Continued from page 153.

ence in the neighborhood of the Gold Coast. Referred to a Joint Commission, whose agreement was ratified by both countries.

72. Persia and Afghanistan, 1891. A long-standing dispute between Persia and Afghanistan in reference to the frontiers of the two countries in the Hashtadan District was settled by Arbitration. It had been committed to the Arbitration of the British Viceroy of India, who entrusted the adjustment of all the details to General MacLean, British Consul-General at Meshed. Both the Shah and the Ameer accepted the decision of the British Referee.

73. In 1891, between Great Britain and France as to the Newfoundland Fisheries. Referred to a Commission of seven. (Still pending.)

74. In 1891, between Great Britain and the United States as to the Behring Sea Seal Fisheries. (Still pending.)

75. Between Portugal and Belgium as to the Angola Boundary Question. Referred to the Pope. (Still pending.)

76, etc. Other cases are still pending; viz., between France and Venezuela, Russia and Afghanistan, Bolivia and Chile, Argentine Republic and Chile.

LEGISLATURES AND ARBITRATION.

The principle of International Arbitration has been formally approved and recommended by the following Legislative bodies:

1. GREAT BRITAIN.—By the House of Commons. July 8, 1873. On the motion of Mr. Henry Richard.

2. ITALY.—By the Chamber of Deputies. November 24, 1873. By a unanimous vote, on the motion of Signor P. S. Mancini.

A similar resolution, moved by Signor Bonghi, was again carried unanimously, in the Italian Chamber of Deputies, in 1890.

3. SWEDEN.—By the Second Chamber of the Diet. March 21, 1874. On the motion of Mr. Jonas Jonasson.

4. HOLLAND.—By the States General. Nov. 27, 1874. On the motion of M. Van Eck.

5. BELGIUM.—By the Chamber of Deputies. January 20, 1875. On the motion of M. Couvreur. Also by the Belgian Senate.

6. DENMARK.—By the Chamber of Deputies, on the petition of 6000 people, on March 27, 1888. A similar resolution was adopted, by 58 votes to 10, on November 13, 1890.

Again on the 21st of November, 1892, on motion of Mr. Frederick Bajer, a resolution was adopted, by a vote of 35 to 20, calling upon the Government to respond favorably to the invitation of the United States to enter into a permanent treaty of arbitration, and to seek the establishment of similar treaties with other states, particularly the northern nations of Europe.

7. NORWAY.—A resolution was passed in the Storting in 1890, by a large majority, in favor of Arbitration.

8. SPAIN.—By the Senate in May, 1890. On the motion of Senator Marcoartu, urging the Government to initiate steps to establish a Court of International Arbitration by the European Powers.

9. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.—The following resolution was adopted on February 15, 1890, by the United States Senate, the House of Representatives concurring: "That the President be, and is hereby requested to invite, from time to time, as fit occasions may arise, negotiations with any Government with which the United States has, or may have, diplomatic relations, to the end that any differences or disputes arising between the two

Governments, which cannot be adjusted by diplomatic agency, may be referred to arbitration, and be peaceably adjusted by such means."

10. THE-PAN AMERICAN CONGRESS OF 1890.—In 1890 the official representatives of *seventeen* American Republics assembled at Washington, U. S. A. A Treaty of Arbitration was adopted and signed on April 28th by the representatives of eleven of the republics and recommended to their several governments. The governments failed to act before the time for ratification stipulated in the treaty had expired. A form of extension was submitted to the original signatories on October 22, 1891, and favorable replies have since been received from seven of them.

11. ROUMANIA.—By the Chamber of Deputies, April 4, 1893. On the motion of I. Ciuflea. Resolution voted unanimously urging the government to adopt arbitration as an accepted means of resolving international controversies.

TEXT OF THE SUNDAY OPENING DECISION.

GIVEN BY CHIEF JUSTICE FULLER IN THE UNITED STATES
CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, AT CHICAGO, JUNE 17.

Deeming it desirable that this matter should be disposed of at once, we shall announce the result arrived at, postponing for want of time the elaboration of the views expressed which will hereafter be filed. Appellees have submitted a motion to dismiss this appeal upon the grounds that the jurisdiction of the Circuit Court was in issue; that the case involved a construction or application of the constitution of the United States, and that the constitutionality of the law of the United States was drawn into question therein; that therefore the appeal from the final decree would be to the Supreme Court of the United States and not to this court, and hence that this appeal, which is from an interlocutory order, cannot be maintained under the seventh section of the judiciary act of March 3, 1891. We do not understand that the power of the Circuit Court to hear and determine the case was denied, but that the appellants contended that the United States had not by their bill made a case properly cognizant in a court of equity. The objection was a want of equity and not a want of power. The jurisdiction of the Circuit Court was therefore not in issue within the meaning and intent of the law so far as the constitution or the application of the constitution of the United States and the constitutionality of the laws of the United States are concerned.

We are of opinion that the order we are called upon to review involved or drew into question neither the one nor the other in the sense that the action of the Circuit Court was invoked. The disposal of the proceedings or the disposition of the contention rests upon the ground as to whether the decision had any reference to the construction or application of the constitution or the validity of acts of Congress in respect of that instance; and the conclusions upon which the order was based were invoked by considerations of that character. The jurisdiction of this court to review the order cannot be defeated at the instance of the appellees because the constitutionality of the matter upon which they rely may have been challenged. The motion to dismiss is overruled.

The question to be determined is whether upon this